Memorandum

Date:

December 16, 2009

To:

Valley Division

From:

DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

Amador Area

File No.:

295.12996.Chapter 6 - Command OT and Grant Management Memo

Subject:

HPG 22.1, CHAPTER 6 – COMMAND OVERTIME AND GRANT

MANAGEMENT

The Amador Area recently completed an in-depth self-inspection of the elements contained within Chapter 6 (Command Overtime and Grant Management) of Highway Patrol Guide (HPG) 22.1, Area Resources Management Guide. Following this inspection, only minor discrepancies were noted or found which require follow-up action. Please refer to the attached Form CHP 680A (Command Inspection Program Exceptions Document) and Form CHP 680P checklists (Command Overtime and Command Grant Management). Should you have any questions regarding this inspection, please feel free to contact me at (209) 223-4890.

B. A. KYNASTON, Lieutenant

Commander

Attachments

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM

FXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

age 1 of 3

Command: Amador Area	Division: Valley	Chapter:	YC
Inspected by: Sqt. R. Sloan #10806		Date: 11-23-2009	· ·

number of the inspection in the Chapter shall be routed to and its due date. This	Inspection	Check appropriate boxes as necessary, or on number. Under "Forward to:" enter the nearl shall be utilized to document innovative potion plans. A CHP 51 Memorandum may be	ractices, suggestions for statewide
TYPE OF INSPECTION Division Level Command L Executive Office Level	.evel	Total hours expended on the inspection: 16	☐ Corrective Action Plan Included ☐ Attachments Included
Follow-up Required:	Forwa		
Chapter Inspection: Inspector's Comments Regar	ding Ir	nnovative Practices:	
None.			
Command Suggestions for S	tatewic	le Improvement:	
one.			
Inspector's Findings:			4.9

Introduction

The Amador Area conducted a comprehensive evaluation of the Command overtime and grants management, to ensure efficiency and compliance with departmental policy. As part of the evaluation, the inspector looked at the Command's grant overtime allocations and administration, supporting documents (i.e., CHP 415s, operational plans, etc.), monthly attendance reports, etc. The inspector was Sergeant Rod Sloan (#10806) of the Amador Area. The inspector began the inspection on November 23, 2009, at 1600 hours, and completed the inspection on November 24, 2009.

The following documents were completed as part of this inspection:

- Exceptions Document (CHP 680A)
- Command Grant Management Checklist (CHP 680P)
- Command Overtime Checklist (CHP 680P)

Prior Audits

is unknown when the last prior audit of these processes was completed.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM

EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

age 2 of 3

Command:	Division:	Chapter:
Amador Area	Valley	6
Inspected by:	Date:	
Sqt. R. Sloan #10806		11-23-2009

Summary	of	Findir	ıgs
---------	----	--------	-----

The only discrepancies noted during this inspection were that occasionally, some officers fail to note
their lunch time on the respective overtime CHP 415 document, and also sometimes fail to write "RDO"
in the "Notes" section of the CHP 415. Beyond the aforementioned discrepancies, the Area appears to
be in compliance with departmental policy and procedures.

Commander's Response: Concur or Do Not Concur (Do Not Concur shall document basis for response)	
The Area Management and Supervisory team will ensure that the two discrepancies listed above are corrected on all future overtime CHP 415 documents.	
Inspector's Comments: Shall address non concurrence by commander (e.g., findings revised, findings unchanged,	
atc.)	
one.	

· ·	•		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
Required Action			
		(2) 图形型体型 化基础管理器 (2) 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	
Corrective Action Plan/Timelin	е		

The Area Management and Supervisory team will ensure that the two discrepancies listed above are corrected on all future overtime CHP 415 documents. The timeline will be ongoing.

Employee would like to discuss this report with	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE	DATE
the reviewer. (See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	D. 4	12-15-09
	INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE	DATE
	Rod 8	12-15-09

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM

EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

age 3 of 3

Command:	Division:	Chapter:
Amador Area	Valley	6
Inspected by:	Date:	
Sgt. R. Sloan #10806		11-23-2009

Reviewer disc	ussed this report with	REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE	DATE
employee		-1/m lc I	land M
	Do not concur	11/st simme	12/22/07
			/ /
		/ //	
		V	

STATE OF CALIFORNIA PARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

OMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM SPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Grant Management

Command:	Division:	Number:
Amador Area Valley		295
Evaluated by:	Date:	
Sgt. R. Sloan #	11-23-2009	
Assisted by:	Date:	
N/A		

applica discrep Further	able legal statues, or deficien pancies and/or deficiencies si rmore, the Exceptions Docun	al items with "Yes" or "No" answers cies noted in the inspections shall hall be documented on an Excepti nent shall include any follow-up ar n" box shall be marked and only c	be comme ons Docum nd/or correc	nted on via t ent and add tive action(s	the "Remar fressed to t s) taken. If	ks" section. <i>A</i> he next level this form is us	Additionally, such of command.
J							
TYPE C	DF INSPECTION		Lead Inspe	ector's Signat	ure:		
	vision Level	○ Command Level		. 1			
L 1010	VISION FEAS	Ø Command Lever	+	Col S	102-		
	ecutive Office Level	☐ Voluntary Self-Inspection					
Fo	ollow-up Required:	Follow-up Inspection	Command	er's Signature	e:		Date:
		□ Follow-up Inspection		<i>V</i>		produce the second according	12-15-09
Ĺ] Yes ⊠ No			6	Control of the second		(2 - 1
m							
For ap	oplicable policy, refer to	: GO 40.6					
ote:	If a "No" or "N/A" box is ch	ecked, the "Remarks" section	ı shall be ul	ilized for e	xplanation	l.	
1.							
		s proposing or has submitted	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:	•
		unding agency other than the					
		OTS) that appears to focus early within the jurisdiction of					
	the Department, did the						
	appropriate assistant co						
2.		through the Highway Safety					
		affic safety-related activities	Yes Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
		cting inventories, need and tem development or program					
	implementations?	terri developinent or program					
3.		nt grant funding to assist with					
	the expenses associated	I with the priority programs	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
	identified by the Nationa	l Highway Traffic Safety					
	Administration?	urad grant funda ara nat					
4.	Has the commander ens	other programs or used for	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
	non-reimbursable overtir		2,100			rtomanto.	
5.	Are concept papers rega	rding grant funding					
	•	els to Grants Management	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:	
	Unit (GMU)? Was GMU contacted to d	determine the current			<u> </u>		
6.		sed for grant projects when	Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:	
preparing concept paper budgets?							

Page

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
PARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

OMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Grant Management

	7.	Is supporting documentation of consent and acceptance (of the work, goods, or services provided by the state on behalf of a local government agency as required by 23 Code of Federal Regulations Part 1250) being submitted to OTS for all grant projects coded as "for local benefit"?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	8.	Were all copies of the grant project agreements, revisions, and claim involces signed by the Project Director, or designated alternate?	Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	9.	Were all inquiries or correspondence concerning the availability of grant funds or other contacts with grant funding agencies coordinated/processed through GMU?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
		Are all expenditures of grant funds approved by GMU prior to entering into any obligations, with the exception of personnel costs?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	11.	Are quarterly progress reports forwarded though channels to GMU in accordance with the instructions contained in the associated project MOU?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Not completed at Area
	12.	Are all requirements of the grant agreement and MOU being met?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
-	13.	Is a final project report being prepared in accordance with the funding agency and departmental requirements upon the termination of the grant project?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	14.	Does every invoice associated with a grant funded project contain the project number and name?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
A		Are all purchases of grant-funded equipment acquired under an OTS grant exceeding a unit cost of \$5,000 being documented on an Equipment Report, Form OTS-25?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	16.	Has grant funded equipment been inspected to ensure it is being utilized in accordance with the respective grant agreement?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	17.	Are applications for federal funds in accordance with Government Code Section 13326 including obtaining approval from the Department of Finance and/or the Governor's office prior to submission to the appropriate federal authority? This would include any of the following: • Applications for federal funds which are not included in the budget approved by the Governor. • Applications for federal funds which exceed the amount specified in the budget.	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
"PARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

OMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Grant Management

18.	Is a federal Standard Form 424, Application for Federal Assistance, filed with the State Clearinghouse for all approved unbudgeted grant requests received by the Department of Finance?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
19.	Has any request for unanticipated federal funds met the criteria for legislative notification set forth in Control Section 28.00 of the annual Budget Act?	☐ Yes	∏·No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
20.	Are grant funds being used for their intended purpose?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
21.	Are grant applications related to the Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program (MCSAP) being routed through the Commercial Vehicle Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
22.	Are grant applications related to the Homeland Security Grant Program being routed through the Emergency Operations Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
Questi	ons 23 through 26 pertain to the Grants Managemen	t Unit			
23.	Has GMU prepared an annual Management Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders soliciting participation in the Department's Highway Safety Program?	☐ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks: Not applicable to the Amador Area
	Did GMU send the concept paper as an attachment to a memorandum through the Planning and Analysis Division to Assistant Commissioner, Field, and Assistant Commissioner, Staff, and their Executive Assistants?	☐ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: : Not applicable to the Amador Area
25.	Did GMU route copies of the Draft Grant Agreement using the CHP Form 60, Staff Summary Statement, to all commands with responsibility for or that have an interest in the project?	☐ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks: : Not applicable to the Amador Area
26.	Was a Memorandum of Understanding between involved commands outlining the responsibilities of each command prepared and distributed by GMU?	☐ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks: : Not applicable to the Amador Area

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
**PARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

.OMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Overtime

Command:	Division:	Number
Amador Area	Valley	295:
Evaluated by:	Date:	
Sgt. R. Sloan #	11-23-2009	
Assisted by:	Date:	
N/A		

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the Exceptions Document shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected.								
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		****				
TYPE OF INSPECTION		Lead Insp	ector's Signa	iture:				
☐ Division Level ☐ Commar	nd Level		in 81)~				
☐ Executive Office Level ☐ Voluntary	Self-Inspection							
Follow-up Required:		Commander's Signature: Date:				Date:		
Yes No	/-up Inspection					12-15-09		
For applicable policies, refer to HPM 11.1	Chanter 6	<u> </u>	Ψ					
HPM 40.71, Chapters 2, 8, and 10, HPM	10.5							
hapter 2, and HPM 10.3, Chapters 24 a	nd 28							
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,								
. ∢ote: If a "No" or "N/A" box is checked, the "F	?emarks" section	⊥ shall he u	tilized for s	volenetov	3			
Is the hiring company/agency for reim	bursable	Signification	I THE COSTORE	γλιαπατίοι	1.			
overtime being held responsible for p	aving a		□No	□ N/A	Remarks:			
minimum of four hours of overtime pe	r CHP					•		
uniformed employee, regardless of le	ngth of	ļ						
service/detail?	_							
Is a minimum of four hours overtime b								
to each CHP uniformed employee(s) i	if cancellation	Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:			
notification is made 24 hours or less p	rior to the							
scheduled detail and the assigned CH	scheduled detail and the assigned CHP uniformed							
employee(s) cannot be notified of suc	h cancellation?							
Are reimbursable special project code	s being used	⊠ Yes						
	all overtime associated with reimbursable special		☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:			
projects? 4. Is the commander ensuring population.								
The first service of the army from a more	ned personnel	57.			Domestee			
overtime Hours are not reflected on the	Report of	⊠ Yes	☐ No	│ □ N/A	Remarks:			
Overtime Hours for Reimbursable Spe 5. Is the commander ensuring non-reimb	ciai Projects /							
overtime is not being claimed for an er	ursable	17/17/			Remarks:			
than Bargaining Unit 7, while on vacat		⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	remaiks.			
compensated time off for hours worked								
regular work shift time?								
6. Is "RDO" being written in the "Notes" s	ection of the				· 			
CHP 415, Daly Field Record, for overti	me worked on	Yes No N/A Remarks: This has not alw done on every OT CHP 41s			is has not always been			
a regular day off?	77017104 011							
	there a CHP 90, Report of Court Appearance -							
Civil Action, completed for each officer	or sergeant	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:			
when overtime is associated for civil co	ourt?		٠٠٠ ليسيا	+ W/F7				

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
PARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

OMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Overtime

8.	Do the CHP 415s with overtime indicate the employee's lunch period or indicate "None" if the employee worked through their lunch break?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: This has not always been done on every OT CHP 415.
9.	Did the supervisor sign the CHP 415s approving the overtime?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Are claimed overtime meals related to overtime worked within 50 miles of the employee's headquarters?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Amador Area personnel infrequently utilize overtime meals.
	If overtime is incurred by a peer support counselor, is the name of the employee to whom support was provided excluded from the CHP 415 of the counselor?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Is the "Notes" section on side two of the CHP 415 used to explain any overtime listed on side one of the CHP 415?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
 13.	Are employee's Compensated Time Off hours maintained within reasonable balances?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□N⁄A	Remarks:
	Is the commander ensuring employees are not incurring overtime due to working over the allotted number of hours for any given Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) period?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks: Although FLSA overtime has been paid in the past, the Amador Area Management Team is diligent at preventing recurrence.
15.	Is the commander ensuring uniformed employees are not working voluntary overtime which results in them working more than 16.5 hours in a 24 hour period?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
16.	Do the CHP 415 total overtime hours agree with the Monthly Attendance Report (MAR)?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
17.	Are the MARs retained for at least three years and contain the commander's signature?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: